

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/487,585 | WELLER, SCOTT WAYNE | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Nathan Hillery | 2176 | |

All Participants:

Status of Application: RCE

(1) Nathan Hillery.

(3) _____.

(2) John Hemmingway.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 13 July 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

35 USC 102 and 103

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

Wolff


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

discussed a proposed amendment that better distinguished the novelty of the invention over the prior art of record and proposed changes that would render the claimed invention unobvious as well. Applicant's representatives agreed at this time

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)